

SN. 10/088,470

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. MATS:036

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-15, 17, and 18 are now pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

Amendment

Claim 16 has been canceled, and independent claims 1 and 14 have been amended to further define the stepped portion/through-hole configuration. Claim 14 incorporates the feature of claim 16. Claim 4 has been canceled because it is believed to be redundant to the extent that claim 1 already calls for the through-hole to extend through the stepped portion. New claims 17 and 18 have been added to define the effect of the present invention, namely enabling the coil fitting arms to be made thinner. No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 1-16¹ were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA) in view of Phillips (USP 5,600,516). Applicant traverses this rejection because the combination, even if it were deemed proper for argument's sake, would not have taught the stepped portion/through-hole configuration called for in independent claims 1 and 14.

Specifically, each of claim 1 and 14 calls for 1) the bottom of the stepped portion to be substantially flush with the bottom of the holding member and 2) the through-holes to have a trapezoidal configuration. Due to the first feature outlined above, the coil fitting arm can be made thinner as opposed to that of the AAPA. Note that in contrast to the examiner's assertion, as the AAPA (see Fig. 14) has the bottom of its stepped member formed between the top and the bottom of the holding member, the AAPA would not have taught the first feature outlined above.

¹. Although the examiner did not explicitly included claims 7, 8, 11-13, and 16 in the rejection heading, the examiner did mention most of these claims in the body of the rejection. Accordingly, applicant has assumed that the examiner meant to reject claims 1-16. Applicant requests confirmation.

SN. 10/088,470

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. MATS:036


The examiner relied upon Phillips for the proposition that using trapezoidal through holes would have been obvious. Note that Fig. 6A of Phillips shows an alternative embodiment where the bottom surface of its holding member 90 is placed on the top surface of its arm 86, not on the stepped portion. Accordingly, the combination, even if deemed proper for argument's sake, still would not have taught making the bottom of the holding member flush with the bottom of the stepped portion.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that claims 1-3, 5-15, 17, and 18 patentably distinguish over the applied art and thus urge the examiner to issue an early Notice of Allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 02/20/04


Marc A. Rossi
Registration No. 31,923

ROSSI & ASSOCIATES
P.O. Box 826
Ashburn, VA 20146-0826
Phone: 703-726-6020